



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/805,716 | 03/22/2004 | Pratik M. Mehta | 16356.844 (DC-05928) | 9212 |

27683 7590 11/06/2006

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100
DALLAS, TX 75202

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

PATEL, ANAND B

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2116

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/805,716 | | MEHTA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | Anand Patel | | 2116 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,8-13,15-18,20-23,25,26,28,30-35,37-39 and 41-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,5,7,14,19,24,27,29,36 and 40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,8-13,15-18,20-23,25,26,28,30-35,37-39 and 41-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Response to Election Requirement filed 9/29/06 is entered and as such Group A, Species 2 is elected. Applicant did not elect species for Groups B-D. In a telephone conversation with James Bell on 10/19/06, applicant elected Group B, Species 2, Group C, Species 3, and Group D, Species 1. As such, claims 2, 5, 7, 14, 19, 24, 27, 29, 36, 40 are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-13, 18, 20-23, 25-26, 28, 30-35, 39, 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No 2004/0029621 to Karaoguz et al (Karaoguz) in view of Rudis.

- As per claims 1, 23, Karaoguz discloses an information handling system (IHS) comprising:
 - A processor (50);
 - A memory (52) coupled to the processor (figure 2);
 - A wireless section (60), coupled to the processor (figure 2), which is powered up to detect the presence of a wireless network external to the IHS (paragraphs 77-81; figure 15) while other sections of the IHS remain in a reduced power state (paragraphs 13, 78).

Karaoguz fails to disclose an indicator. Rudis teaches an indicator (page 1, paragraph 4), coupled to the wireless section (display is contained in the device itself), to provide an indication to the user that a wireless network is present with which the IHS can communicate (page 1, paragraph 4). An advantage of the system taught by Rudis is the ability to detect wireless activity within a

certain range (page 1, paragraph 2; page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Karaoguz with the indicator as taught by Rudis.

Motivation to modify is to reduce hardware requirements and increase security.

- As per claims 3, 25, Karaoguz discloses wherein the reduced power state is a suspend state (paragraph 13).
- As per claims 4, 26, Karaoguz discloses wherein the wireless section is a wireless card (60) that plugs into the IHS (figure 2).
- As per claims 6, 28, Karaoguz discloses wherein powering up the wireless section is done prior to booting the IHS (paragraph 16).
- As per claims 8, 30, Rudis teaches actuating a scan switch to commence powering up the wireless section (page 1, paragraph 5).
- As per claim 9, Karaoguz discloses powering up the wireless section in response to a wake command (paragraph 16; inherent given powering up of part of the system while other parts are in a low power state).
- As per claims 10, 31, Karaoguz discloses including providing power to both the wireless section and at least one of the other sections of the IHS from a common power source (paragraphs 48-49).
- As per claim 32, Karaoguz discloses wherein the remaining section includes the processor (64).
- As per claims 11, 33, Karaoguz discloses wherein the wireless section and the other sections of the IHS are situated in a common housing (figure 2; paragraph 35).
- As per claims 12-13, 34-35, Rudis teaches wherein the indicator is an LED (page 1, paragraph 4).
- As per claims 18, 39, Rudis teaches wherein powering up the wireless section is performed with auxiliary power (page 1, paragraph 4).
- As per claims 20, 41, Rudis teaches wherein the indication is variable (page 1, paragraph 4).

Art Unit: 2116

- As per claims 21, 42, Karaoguz discloses wherein the powering up a wireless section step is performed at predetermined times (paragraph 80).
- As per claims 22, 43, Karaoguz discloses wherein the predetermined times include fixed time intervals (paragraph 80).

4. Claims 15-17, 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaoguz in view of Rudis and Pacchiano.

- As per claims 15-16, 37, Karaoguz teaches a memory in the wireless section (75). Karaoguz and Rudis fail to disclose including storing profile information in the memory. Pacchiano teaches a memory storing profile information (page 4, memory storing preferred networks). An advantage of the system taught by Pacchiano is the ability to automatically connect to an available high priority network (page 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Karaoguz and Rudis with the profile storage memory as taught by Pacchiano. Motivation to modify is to improve user friendliness.
- As per claims 17, 38, Pacchiano teaches determining if a detected network matches a network included in a profile stored in the memory (page 4, method by which networks are connected to using priority in the preferred network list).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- US Patent Application Publication No 2005/0239463 to Lagnado teaches essentially the same invention as the instant application.

Art Unit: 2116

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anand Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-7211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571) 272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ABP



REHANA PERVEEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
11/2/06